

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

JAS SUPPLY, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

RADIANT CUSTOMS SERVICES, INC.,  
et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:21-cv-01015-TL

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR LEAVE

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff JAS Supply, Inc.'s motion for leave to file additional briefing related to its pending motion for reconsideration. Dkt. No. 124. Specifically, Plaintiff seeks permission to file a motion to strike Defendants' response in opposition to the motion for reconsideration, or in the alternative, leave to file a reply brief. Having reviewed the motion and the relevant record, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's motion for leave to file additional briefing.

On November 29, 2023, Plaintiff timely filed a motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 120) of the Court's Order on the Parties' cross-motions for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 119).

1 Pursuant to the Local Civil Rules (“LCRs”), motions for reconsideration are disfavored and place  
2 a stringent standard on the moving party to establish that such a remedy is warranted in the first  
3 instance. LCR 7(h)(1). Responsive briefing on motions for reconsideration is generally not  
4 allowed unless requested by the Court. LCR 7(h)(3). Similarly, the Court has broad discretion to  
5 determine the extent of any responsive briefing that will be allowed, *i.e.*, whether to request only  
6 opposition briefing or to also authorize a reply from the moving party. *Id.* The Court may also set  
7 length restrictions on the requested briefing. *Id.* Here, the Court requested responsive briefing  
8 from Defendants, limited to a maximum of 2,100 words, and expressly stated that “[n]o reply  
9 briefing is authorized.” Dkt. No. 122.

10 Plaintiff’s motion to strike is moot. The request to strike Defendants’ response brief is  
11 premised on Defendants failure to include a word count certification with their brief as required  
12 by LCR 7(e)(6). Dkt. No. 124 at 3. Subsequently, Defendants filed a praecipe correcting this  
13 error. Dkt. No. 125; *see also* LCR 7(m). More importantly, despite initially failing to include the  
14 required certification, Defendants’ brief complies with the Court’s word count limitation.

15 The Court, in its discretion, also finds that additional briefing on the motion for  
16 reconsideration is not warranted. Plaintiff argues that Defendants’ response brief includes errors  
17 of law. Dkt. No. 124 at 3. Determining questions of law is the Court’s responsibility. *Nationwide*  
18 *Transp. Fin. v. Cass Info. Sys., Inc.*, 523 F.3d 1051, 1058 (9th Cir. 2008) (“Resolving doubtful  
19 questions of law is the distinct and exclusive province of the trial judge.” (quoting *United States*  
20 *v. Weitzenhoff*, 35 F.3d 1275, 1287 (9th Cir.1993) (internal quotation marks omitted))). The  
21 Court is more than capable of determining the appropriate law to apply to the relevant facts and  
22 claims on reconsideration and will disregard any arguments based on the misapplication of  
23 irrelevant legal authority. Plaintiff’s request for additional briefing is therefore unnecessary.

1           Consequently, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's motion (Dkt. No. 124) for leave to file  
2 additional briefing regarding its motion for reconsideration.

3           Dated this 9th day of January 2024.

4           

5           \_\_\_\_\_  
6 Tana Lin  
7 United States District Judge  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24